2: Flannery E-5 (1940-1948) 1953
/ NQ13 Gros Ventre NQ13

to himself: 'He gave to me, so I'll give to him.' But no one was in duty bound to give the equivalent in return."

Within the network of kinship obligations, exchange was more often indirect than reciprocal. A man could expect help from his father and from his mother's brother without being under obligation to return goods in like amount—he was supposed to repay them by conducting himself in such a way that they could be proud of him. This meant that the man in his turn would be especially generous toward his sister and her children, that he would adequately fulfill his duties toward his wife's people and provide goods in sufficient amount that his wife could fulfill her own obligations especially those toward her own brother's wife and children.

When others saw fit to honor an individual, say for bravery in warfare, that person was supposed to give away goods in large amounts to show that he appreciated the honor; and his relatives would join with him in giving, thereby increasing his, as well as their own, prestige. Likewise in paying for services, such as those of a medicine man, relatives would "chip in" to the best of their ability, the one assuming the largest part of the burden receiving the greatest boost in public esteem. A person who impoverished himself by giving generously at such times would be sure that, with his reputation thus established, he would soon be the recipient of gifts dispensed by others in like liberality. Meantime, however, he could not afford to sit back awaiting the presents from others. He would soon lose his coveted reputation and be referred to as lazy, an epithet strong enough to bring tears to the eyes of a man who entertained any ambitions whatsoever.

If a person were in need, it was possible for him to request what was necessary, preferably from some relative who was well-to-do, and usually his request would be met. But a continual borrower lost status and a limit was thus put upon indiscriminate "begging." One woman stated: "If your sister asked you for something you would not refuse her, but it was to your brother's wife you would give things voluntarily. A woman had great pride in keeping her brother's wife well-dressed, and if you had an extra supply of dried berries she is the one you would think of first."

Thus we have the basis for the generalizations the Gros Ventres

2: Flannery E-5 (1940-1948) 1953
NQ13 Gros Ventre NQ13

684 ing indemnity from his wife's lover and allowing her unharmed to go to him. This solution was often resorted to and in fact was the one that was urged upon both parties concerned. It was customary for the paramour to offer compensation, although an occasional individual tried to dispose of an unwanted wife with profit to himself by taking the initiative in demanding indemnity. If there were no real evidence of wrong-doing, or if the man in question wished to brave the consequences, he might refuse. One instance was given by Singer concerning a man who, returning home one night, saw a young man crouched beside the lodge. "Although he took after the young man when he ran away, he could not catch him. The next day he told one of his wives—the sister of the one whom he pretended to suspect—to take her younger sister to the young man and demand in return a gun and a horse. The elder sister took up for the younger one and refused. So the husband told his oldest wife, unrelated to the other two, to carry out his orders. This one did as she was told. When confronted by the demand, however, the young man said: 'There is no truth in it. The old man did see something that made it look bad for me, but it wasn't what he thought.' The husband did not care to force the issue, since real evidence was lacking, and that was an end to the matter." Another example shows that even when the husband had evidence of his wife's infidelity he could not always collect indemnity. The husband in question sent his wife to her lover with a long list of things which he requested in return. The paramour, who did not want the woman as his wife, refused to pay the indemnity. "Perhaps another man would have killed his wife's lover when he refused; but this one took the easier [682] way by cutting off his wife's hair and turning her loose." In case the husband killed the paramour, it was interpreted as murder and he was subject to retaliation.

[554] A man who kept as wife a woman known to be unfaithful to him lost status. He would be considered weak and was subject to 684 humiliating taunts by his enemy-friends. Nevertheless some men 558 braved adverse public opinion out of deep affection for their erring wives. While not all went so far as Sits Like A Woman, his case is an interesting one. It was related by The Boy as follows.

"The famous chief Sits Like A Woman was at the height of

2: Flannery E-5 (1940-1948) 1953
NQ13 Gros Ventre NQ13

his popularity and power when he caught *in flagrante delicto* the youngest of his four current wives. He failed to act immediately, so the father of the young man with whom she had been discovered began to think of a way to save his son [fearing that Sits Like A Woman planned to injure him]. He decided to approach one of the ceremonial grandfathers of the chief and ask him to intercede. The ceremonial grandfather accepted the mission. He told Sits Like A Woman that the young man's father had such a high regard for him that he would not like to see his household disturbed any further and that, if he would consider this request, he should name the price. The chief listened very attentively and finally replied: 'Grandfather, I will do as you say. I have been thinking what I should do about this, and I have not punished my unfaithful wife nor even scolded her. Since it is you who came here to make this request of me, I will solve the situation in this way. Go back and tell the old man who sent you that I want his son's racehorse and eight other well-broken horses, and I want that old man to come over here and escort his new daughter-in-law back to his home. She is just as she always was. I have not disfigured her nor punished her, so he can make use of her in his household. When he carries out this demand, I will forget the whole matter.' The ceremonial grandfather was highly pleased and praised the chief for removing the stigma from his home by relinquishing his unfaithful wife. The father of the young man immediately set about getting the required horses and he and his wife loaded some of them with clothing and other articles. Together they led the horses toward the lodge of the chief, ostentatiously singing in his praise as they went. The old man even danced as he approached the lodge. After handing over the goods, the couple, followed by their new daughter-in-law, went back to their own lodge, all three singing as they went.

"This should conclude the story of how a great chief received indemnity. There was a sequel, however, which illustrates that even the greatest and bravest warriors may succumb to the weakness of love and affection for their wives. On that very same day, about dusk, the chief's 'heart failed him.' He ordered the nine horses to be turned loose so that they could return to the camp from which they had come, although he kept the clothes and other

2: Flannery E-5 (1940-1948) 1953
NQ13 Gros Ventre NQ13

684
558

articles which had been given him. Then he told two of his wives to go to the camp and call from outside the lodge the name of that youngest wife, and, when she came out, to bring her back to him without offering any explanation. This placed Sits Like a Woman in a difficult position, giving his enemy-friends plenty of ammunition since they could justly taunt him that a woman had gotten the better of him. He was eventually able to live it down, however, so that although it was a temporary set-back to his colorful career, it did not mar it completely as might have been the case for a lesser man."

The above case was exceptional in that no others could be recalled wherein a man who had accepted indemnity actually took back his wife. Nevertheless other instances were given of men who disregarded public opinion to the extent that they ignored flagrant infidelity on the part of their wives. Usually however if the wife in question did not mend her ways, even the most tolerant husband lost patience. By giving her away quite casually and without compensation, he retrieved his reputation since he thus indicated that it was indifference toward her rather than the weakness of love which had caused him to overlook her infidelity.

One instance was given by Coming Daylight. "One of my uncle's wives was continually running away with different men and he allowed her to return each time without punishment. I was still a child and one day, for instance, I went with this woman for water rather far from camp. When we got to the creek, one of her lovers grabbed her and wouldn't let her go. Finally I got tired of waiting and called out that I was going home and would tell on them. Still she didn't come, so I left. My uncle asked me why I had come alone, so I told him what had happened. But when that woman showed up, my uncle said nothing to her. A long time went by. Then on one occasion when we were camped near the Bear Paws, there was a crowd of people, all more or less drunk, in my uncle's lodge. They called me in because I did not drink and, since my uncle was Keeper, they had to have someone to look after the Flat Pipe. So I was there and saw my uncle staggering around. His nose was running and he called a man by name and said: 'Come and clean my nose!' The man obliged him and my uncle said, pointing to that unfaithful wife of his:

2: Flannery E-5 (1940-1948) 1953
NQ13 Gros Ventre NQ13

'It is a good thing you cleaned my nose, because for that I am giving you that woman over there.'"

A husband who had harbored an unfaithful wife was likewise within his rights in "throwing her away." This was accomplished by his going to a public gathering and simply throwing down a stick to indicate that he was through with her. Whoever wished might pick up the stick and claim her as his wife without giving any compensation.

It was said, too, that if a man was "big enough" to allow his wife to go unpunished for adultery he usually would not refuse to eventually let her go to some lesser man who demeaned himself by asking for her. Thick related details of several transactions of this kind which occurred when he was a young boy. One of these was as follows:

"There was a man who had several wives, perhaps four. One day another man came to his lodge. He invited him in and said: 'This is the first time you ever came into my lodge, my friend. You must have a reason to come now, after all this time.' Then he said to his wife: 'Woman, get up and cook for my friend.' So the visitor spoke up: 'Well, my friend, the purpose of my coming here is to ask you for that Arapaho woman. I am not married now, I haven't a wife at present and I need a wife.' The host replied: 'All right, my friend, she is yours. After you eat, you could take her home.' When he had finished eating, the visitor said: 'Well, my friend, I have to go a little further. I want that boy of hers too.' The host answered: 'I hate to let my children go, but since he is so small you could take him, but don't ask for any of the others.' So the visitor, happy that he had gotten this woman without much talk and a boy as well, said: 'Well, my friend, since you are so good to me and give me your boy, I will give you a horse, my last horse.' It turned out that he was as good to this boy, whom he had attained in this way, as he would have been to his own son." It should be noted that the horse was given voluntarily and because of the child rather than in compensation for the wife.

It was the opinion of those women who had lived under this system, wherein the authority of the husband was so great, that all in all it worked well. They admitted that an occasional woman

4: Flannery & Cooper E-5 (1939-1945) 1946
NQ13 Gros Ventre NQ13

525 gambling, even for the small stakes, mostly arrows, which children could put up. Further, advice against gambling was commonly given by tribal leaders as well as by relatives and friends, presumably with more particular reference to gambling for high stakes.

[558] Excessive or inveterate high-stake gamblers easily lost the respect of the people and were looked down upon. Such were not likely to be chosen as "chiefs," and could not be chosen as keepers of the sacred pipes. The possession of gambling power from prairie chickens or ghosts netted the possessor a certain prestige, but not nearly the prestige that came from achievements in war or medicine, or even from skill in hunting. Keg, whose story we have given above, had little real prestige, we were told. Red Whip had more, it seems, but this or much of it may well have been the result of his outstanding war record.

The foregoing ambivalent attitude can, we believe, be accounted for, in large part at least, by the data we have, incomplete though these data are. It is pretty clear from the prevalent bettor-wager pattern that the Gros Ventre recognized two more or less conflicting aspects of their gambling: a recreative one and a predatory one. Certain kinds of gambling were indulged in predominantly for friendly recreation, to have a good time together. The minor wagering therein merely added a little spice and zest to play, while the losers suffered no appreciable loss or hurt. Other kinds, the common games for large stakes and the occasional ones for career prestige, were indulged in predominantly for gain and this at the expense of the losers, for acquisition in which the losers suffered losses that were grievously felt and that seriously hurt. As the bettor-wager pattern shows, gambling of the first kinds was recognized as consistent with the accepted canons of in-group altruism and benevolence; that of the second, as inconsistent therewith.

Actually gambling contributed both to social concord and solidarity and to social discord and disunion. It must have contributed in some measure to social concord and solidarity inasmuch as it provided a large measure of pleasurable recreation and excitement shared in common and a relatively innocuous outlet for aggression and dominance. The Gros Ventre were consciously concerned with fomenting solidarity within their ranks: for one thing they were a fighting people beset with powerful enemies. But whether they were aware of the role their gambling played in positively and constructively promoting solidarity is not possible to say on the evidence we have and at this distance of time.

As regards, however, discord resulting from gambling, this was common and they were keenly aware of it. The code demanded that losers should take their losses, together with the associated twitting and strutting by the winners, in good

4: Flannery & Cooper E-5 (1939-1945) 1946
NQ13 Gros Ventre NQ13

part and as good sports, but actual behavior not infrequently fell short of the code's demands. Bad feeling was at times engendered and could and did end in blows and violence, as was noted earlier in our account of the wheel game. Quarrels among gambling boys must have been fairly common. One of our informants, Thick, recounted three different bow and arrow contests for arrows, in which contests he had engaged as a boy with other boys. All three ended in violence started by the losers. In one of the three set-tos, Thick, the winner, was shot in the hand with an arrow by the other boy (who lost his temper, and Thick still, at the age of 75, carries the scar. That the Gros Ventre were perfectly aware, as of course they must have been, of the discord hazard in gambling, is clear from such counsel as, for example, Thick's mother used to give him when he was a boy: "If you join in those gambling games somebody is going to get mad on account of getting beaten and he may pound you up." Further, that gambling often led to bad feeling was given to us by The Boy as the reason why the Gros Ventre disapproved of gambling between relatives.

So far as we could make out, Gros Ventre attitudes on gambling were determined in only minor measure by economic considerations. In the days before the disappearance of the buffalo in 1883-84, the Gros Ventre lived under a normal economy of abundance. Moreover, generosity in parting with their possessions, through gift and sharing, was focal in code and practice. Criers around the camp would counsel the people in words such as: "Men and women, don't love your property. You will always acquire other property. Only life never comes back, but property you can have back any time." In the long run for most individuals winnings would balance losses, just as gifts tended to balance gifts—a system of exchange which incidentally must have served to prevent unhealthy accumulation of wealth in the hands of any individual or small group. The cases of really ruinous loss of property through gambling, of reduction to "pauperism," appear to have been rare, and even in these cases the losers would ordinarily be looked after temporarily and tided over by their kin or friends. At any rate we got no record of individuals or their dependents suffering grave privation of the necessities of life as a result of gambling losses.

How far such facts entered into the Gros Ventre attitude toward gambling cannot be determined confidently from such evidence as we have. In our hours of free discussion with informants, there was almost no intimation of economic considerations leading to disapproval. One of the themes in the tongue-lashing Lame Bull got from his father after the disastrous contest with White Owl may have been the economic, but this was not expressly stated by The Boy. Mrs Warrior kept away from gambling because, she said: "I liked what I had and